

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-20 have been canceled, without prejudice, and claims 21-40 have been added. As a result, claims 21-40 are pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on or about 24 April 2007 with Applicants' representative, Darrell L. Pogue, Reg. No. 57,878. During the interview, the independent claims were discussed with respect to their corresponding prior art rejections. No exhibits were presented and no agreement was reached.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 15, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ellis (U.S. 3,105, 359) in view of Roh (U.S. 6,283,347); claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. 5,060,314) in view of Roh; claims 5, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ellis, in view of Roh, and further in view of Kearl (U.S. Pat. No. 6,193,118); claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (U.S. 3,105,359) in view of Roh, and further in view of Rakow (U.S. 3,849,804); claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Roh and further in view of Kearl, and further in view of Echeverri (U.S. 5,816,563); claims 8, 12, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Roh and further in view of Woods (U.S. 6,029,877); claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being

unpatentable over Ellis in view of Roh and further in view of Woods; claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Roh and further in view of Echeverri; and claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Roh and further in view of Crispin (U.S. 5,465,425). Applicants note that these rejections are now moot in light of the newly presented claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are patentable over the cited art as presented. For example, with respect to claim 21, Applicants note that none of the cited art teaches or suggests, *inter alia*, a backpack having a bottom opening pocket. In sharp contrast, the only references to disclose a bottom opening pocket, Ellis and Lewis, both disclose bottom opening pockets on a vest and jacket, respectively. Further, these references disclose that the bottom opening pocket open toward the body to enable the contents to readily fall away from the body. In sharp contrast, the claimed invention includes a bottom opening pocket that opens on a left/right side or away from the body so as to assist an individual in controlling an object stored in the bottom opening pocket as it passes through the opening.

With respect to claim 30, Applicants note that none of the cited art teaches or suggests, *inter alia*, a pocket that includes a bottom flap for covering an opening at a bottom of the holding area, means for releasably attaching the bottom flap such that an individual can open the bottom flap by pulling in a downward manner with one hand while the pocket is adjacent to the back and a zipper for attaching the bottom flap to at least one of: the outer side, the left side, the right side, or the inner side. The zipper can provide a stronger, more sturdy attachment when quick access to the contents of the pocket is not desired.

With respect to claim 37, none of the cited references teaches or suggests, *inter alia*, a wheelchair including a bottom opening pocket held adjacent to a back rest as in the claimed invention.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John LaBatt/

John W. LaBatt, Reg. No. 48,301
Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

Date: 20 June 2007